

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the arguments set forth fully below. Previously, claims 1-29 and 33-44 were pending. In the Office Action mailed August 4, 2004, claims 26-29 and 33-44 have been allowed and claims 1-25 have been rejected. In response, Applicants have submitted the following remarks. Accordingly, claims 1-29 and 33-44 are still pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 10-15, 18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 4,191,971 to Dischert et al. (hereinafter Dischert) in view of Applicants' admitted prior art.

In particular, it is asserted within the Office Action that claims 1, 6, 10 and 15 are unpatentable in that Dischert discloses an apparatus/method for receiving video signals from video cameras, comprising first a selector/multiplexer that, though not specifically disclosed as having a plurality of inputs, would have made obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art the incorporation of the conventionally well known concept as taught by Applicants' admitted prior art so that the selector multiplexer includes a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals from a plurality of cameras as an alternative and an efficient way to select a video camera signal from a plurality of video cameras. Applicants respectfully traverse this conclusion.

It is well settled that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met:

- 1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings;
- 2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and
- 3) the prior art reference, or references, must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143.

The burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the teachings of Dischert and Applicants admitted prior art has not been met within the Office Action.

There is no suggestion or teaching within either Dischert or Applicants admitted prior art which would lead to every claim limitation present in the current invention. Applicants submit that the present invention includes a multiplexer that receives video signals directly from video cameras, as the multiplexer is directly in a path between the video cameras and the video decoder. Referring to figure 3 of the present invention, it is apparent that the **video cameras 302, 304, 306** directly provide the **multiplexer 308** with video signals **before the video signals ever reach the video decoder 310**. In contrast to the present invention as disclosed and claimed, in figure 1 Dischert discloses video cameras 17, 217 providing video signals to camera processors 21, 221, **not to the camera selector switch 220**. In fact, the camera selector switch 220 in Dischert provides only output cables 241, 242 for disabling the camera processors 21, 221, and does not receive a video signal. In fact, the structure in figure 1 of Dischert more closely resembles figure 2 of the present invention which depicts the prior art than it does the structure described and claimed in figure 3 of the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants contend that Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art makes obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art only the substitution of a selector/multiplexer having a plurality of inputs for the selector/multiplexer not necessarily having a plurality of inputs as disclosed by Dischert. The Applicants' admitted prior art in no way suggests the novel features of claims 1, 6, 10 and 15 one of which is the differing order of method steps, yielding results that the art of record fails to anticipate or make obvious. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1, 6, 10 and 15 based on the combination of Dischert and Applicants' admitted prior art, is not proper and should be withdrawn.

It is also asserted within the Office Action that claims 1, 6, 10 and 15 are anticipated in that Dischert discloses a video decoder coupled to the selector for receiving a selected one of the plurality of video signals and a controller coupled to the video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Dischert does not teach a video decoder coupled to the selector for receiving a selected one of the plurality of video signals and further that Dischert does not teach controller coupled to the video decoder wherein the controller conditions the video decoder according to a parameter representative of the selected one of the video signals as taught in the present invention.

Dischert discloses a transmission line cable terminated at both ends and routed through a plurality of separate television cameras and a television monitor. Each camera includes a current source coupled to the cable. The video from the camera modulates the current source to produce a signal across the terminations without changing the impedance across the line [Dischert, Abstract].

Applicants' admitted prior art discloses a system wherein a plurality of cameras send signals to a plurality of decoders which then send decoded signals to a selector/multiplexer having a plurality of inputs, wherein each input receives one of a plurality of decoded video signals from the cameras [Present Invention, Figure 2].

However, Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art does not teach a selector/multiplexer having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of undecoded video signals. In figure 1 Dischert teaches a camera selector switch 220 having two output cables 241, 242 for instructing camera processors 21 & 221 to disable the camera [Dischert, col. 3, lines 48-51]. Furthermore, the cameras 17, 217 are coupled to and send the video signal to the camera processors 21, 221, not to the camera selector switch 220 [Dischert, col. 2, lines 48-52]. Even if a person of ordinary skill in the art, upon viewing Dischert, were compelled to incorporate the conventionally well known concept as taught by Applicant's admitted prior art so that the selector/multiplexer includes a plurality of inputs, wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals from cameras, the resulting configuration of this combination would be no different than that shown in figure 2 of the present invention which depicts the prior art. This is because Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art provides no hint, suggestion, motivation or teaching toward multiplexing the undecoded signals before they enter the video decoder and conditioning the decoder according to a parameter representative of the selected video signal, as taught by the present invention.

Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art also does not teach a controller coupled to the video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter as taught in the present invention. As stated within the Office Action, Dischert discloses a controller (27 or 8 or 219) coupled to the video decoder (21 or 221) for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter (col. 2, lines 1-9). Applicants note that Dischert discloses a parameter representative of the operator's adjustments made at the operator's console (col. 2, lines 3-7 and lines 23-28). In contrast the present invention discloses a parameter representative of the selected one of the plurality of video signals.

In contrast to the teachings of Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art, the apparatus and method of receiving video signals from video cameras of the present invention includes video cameras each coupled to provide a video signal to a respective input of a multiplexer. The multiplexer routes a selected one of the video signals to a video decoder. The video decoder receives the selected video signal and is conditioned according to the video signal. This includes synchronizing the video decoder to a frequency and phase of the video signal,

controlling a gain level for the video signal and adjusting a dc clamping level for dc restoration of the video signal. Parameters representative of each of these quantities are stored in association with the identity of the corresponding video camera. The video decoder also places each video signal into a format suitable for storage in a storage device and for display by a display device. As the multiplexer is utilized to cycle through the cameras according to a sequence, the parameters for each camera are retrieved and utilized to initialize the video decoder for decoding the video signal received from the corresponding camera. As a result, the amount of time required to condition the video decoder according to the video signal received from each camera is significantly reduced.

[Abstract of the Present Invention]

The independent claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for receiving video signals from a plurality of video cameras. The apparatus of claim 1 includes a selector having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals, a video decoder coupled to an output of the selector wherein the video decoder receives a selected one of the plurality of video signals and a controller coupled to the video decoder wherein the controller conditions the video decoder according to a parameter representative of the selected one of the video signals. As described above, Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art does not teach a selector/multiplexer having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of undecoded video signals. Furthermore, Applicants submit that Dischert does not teach a controller coupled to the video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Dischert.

Claims 2-6 depend from the independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art. Accordingly, claims 2-6 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent claim 10 is directed to an apparatus for receiving video signals from a plurality of video cameras. The apparatus of claim 10 includes a selector having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of video signals, a video decoder coupled to an output of the selector wherein the video decoder receives a selected one of the plurality of video signals and a controller coupled to the video decoder wherein the controller conditions the video decoder according to a plurality of parameters representative of the selected one of the video signals. As described above, Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art does not teach a selector/multiplexer having a plurality of inputs wherein each input receives one of a plurality of undecoded video signals. Furthermore, Applicants submit that Dischert does not teach a controller

coupled to the video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 10 is allowable over the teachings of Dischert.

Claims 11-15 and 22 depend from the independent claim 10. As discussed above, claim 10 is allowable over Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art. Accordingly, claims 11-15 and 22 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 18 depends from the independent claim 10. As discussed above, claim 10 is allowable over Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art. Accordingly, claim 18 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 7, 16-17 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dischert in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,139 to Cooper et al. (hereinafter Cooper). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 7, 16-17 and 23 depend from the independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed above, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art. Accordingly, claims 7, 16-17 and 23 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 8-9 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dischert in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,659 to Vincent (hereinafter Vincent). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 8-9 and 24-25 depend from the independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed above, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art. Accordingly, claims 8-9 and 24-25 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dischert in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,167,021 to Holmes (hereinafter Holmes). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 19-21 depend from the independent claim 10. As discussed above, claim 10 is allowable over Dischert in view of Applicants' admitted prior art. Accordingly, claims 19-21 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: 10-14-04

By: Thomas B. Haverstock

Thomas B. Haverstock
Reg. No. 32,571
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))
I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP.

Date: 10/14/04 By: [Signature]